



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,004	11/19/2003	Brendan Clarke Fields	MS#303720.01 (5222)	7594
38779	7590	03/28/2006	EXAMINER	
SENNIGER POWERS ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE, 16TH FLOOR ST. LOUIS, MO 63102			BOTTs, MICHAEL K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/717,004	FIELDS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael K. Botts	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2003 and 03 June 2005.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-3, 6-16, 20-25 and 29-31 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 4, 5, 17-19 and 26-28 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) .  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date June 3, 2005.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This document is the first Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: The Non-Provisional Application, which was filed on November 19, 2003.
2. Claims 1-31 have been examined, with claims 1, 8, 9, 13, 14, 22, 23, and 31 being the independent claims.
3. Claims 4, 5, 17-19, 26-28, and are objected to.
4. Claims 1-3, 6-16, 20-25, and 29-31 are rejected.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

5. An singed and dated copy of applicant's IDS form 1449, which was filed on June 3, 2005, is attached to this Office Action.

### ***Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1-3, 6-16, 20-25, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by GalaxyTrading.net, "GalaxySpy, Monitor & Secure Your Internet Connectivity," October 2, 2002, last downloaded by the Examiner on March 19,**

2006 from:

<http://web.archive.org/web/2002102230917/www.galaxytrading.net/galaxyspy.jsp>,  
pages 1-2 [hereinafter "GalaxySpy"].

Regarding **independent claim 1**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*A method for blocking dereferencing elements in a message, the method comprising:*

*accepting a source file for the message;*

*identifying one or more elements within the message source file, wherein the elements specify references to sources of content to be dereferenced upon rendering of the message;*

*rewriting the references to the sources of content of the elements identified in the message source;*

*passing the message source to a message display output; and*

*rendering the message in the message display.*

(See, GalaxySpy, teaching a system wherein the following actions are inherent: downloading a source file with a message, identifying elements within the message source file wherein the elements specify references to sources of content to be dereferenced upon rendering of the message, passing the message source to a message display output, and rendering the message in the message display. See also, GalaxySpy, teaching that the "web bugs" that are the "references to sources of content

to be dereferenced upon rendering of the message," and that such "web bugs" are displayed or logged.)

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 1 further comprising specifying a security policy setting, wherein the rewriting of the references to the sources of content is in accordance with the security policy setting.*

(See, GalaxySpy, teaching the HTTP requests can be displayed or logged and that blocked domains may be unblocked..)

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 1 wherein the rewriting of the references to the sources of content comprises replacing the reference to the source of content with an empty string.*

(It is noted that rewriting links is a method by which dereferencing links are blocked.

See, GalaxySpy teaching that HTTP requests may be blocked.)

Regarding **dependent claim 6**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 1 wherein the message source file is a Hypertext Mark-up Language (HTML) document.*

(See, GalaxySpy, teaching HTML as the language of the message source.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 1 wherein the message display is an HTML rendering display.*

(See, GalaxySpy, teaching HTML as the language of the message source. It is inherent in a message in HTML that, absent intervention, the message will be displayed as an HTML rendering.)

Regarding **independent claim 8**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*A computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing a method for blocking dereferencing elements in a message, the method comprising:*

*accepting a source file for the message;  
identifying one or more elements within the message source file, wherein the elements specify references to sources of content to be dereferenced upon rendering of the message;*

*rewriting the references to the sources of content of the elements identified in the message source;*

*passing the message source to a message display output; and  
rendering the message in the message display.*

(Claim 8 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 9**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*A method for removing referring source information in a hyperlinked document, the method comprising:*

*accepting a source file for the document;*

*identifying one or more elements within the message source file, wherein the elements specify references to hyperlinks;*

*rewriting the references to the hyperlinks identified in the message source to be prepended with a reference to a redirect file;*

*passing the message source to a message display output; and*

*rendering the message in the message display.*

(Claim 9 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 10**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 9 further comprising specifying a security policy setting, wherein the rewriting of the references to the hyperlinks is in accordance with the security policy setting.*

(Claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 11**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 9 wherein the message source file is an HTML document.*

(Claim 11 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 12**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 9 wherein the message display is an HTML rendering display.*

(Claim 12 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 13**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*A computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing a method for removing referring source information in a hyperlinked document, the method comprising:*

*accepting a source file for the document;*  
*identifying one or more elements within the message source file, wherein the elements specify references to hyperlinks;*  
*rewriting the references to the hyperlinks identified in the message source to be prepended with a reference to a redirect file;*  
*passing the message source to a message display output; and*

*rendering the message in the message display.*

(Claim 13 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 14**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*A method for blocking dereferencing elements in a message, the method comprising:*

*accepting a source file for the message;*

*rendering the file in a first message display output;*

*grouping one or more elements within the rendered message into security level groups;*

*rewriting the elements to be processed through a protocol handler;*

*passing the message source to a second message display output; and*

*rendering the message in the second message display.*

(Claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 15**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 14 further comprising specifying a security policy setting, wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler is in accordance with the security policy setting.*

(Claim 15 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 16**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 15 wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler comprises redirecting to an original target destination.*

(Claim 16 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 20**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 14 wherein the message source file is an HTML document.*

(Claim 20 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 21**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 14 wherein the first and second message displays are HTML rendering displays.*

(Claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 22**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*A computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing a method for blocking dereferencing elements in a message, the method comprising:*

*accepting a source file for the message;*

*rendering the file in a first message display output;*

*grouping one or more elements within the rendered message into security level groups;*

*rewriting the elements to be processed through a protocol handler;*

*passing the message source to a second message display output; and*

*rendering the message in the second message display.*

(Claim 22 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 23**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*A method for blocking dereferencing elements in a message, the method comprising:*

*accepting a source file for the message;*

*rendering the file in a first message display output;*

*grouping one or more elements within the rendered message into security level groups;*

*rewriting the elements to be processed through a protocol handler;*

*passing the message source to a second message display output;  
rendering the message in the second message display;  
combining a base Uniform Resource Locator (URL) and a relative URL  
into a full URL; and  
passing the full URL to be processed to a protocol handler.*

(Claim 23 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 24**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 23 further comprising specifying a security policy setting, wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler is in accordance with the security policy setting.*

(Claim 24 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 25**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 24 wherein the processing of the elements by the protocol handler comprises redirecting to an original target destination.*

(Claim 25 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 29**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 23 wherein the message source file is an HTML document.*

(Claim 29 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 30**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*The method of claim 23 wherein the first and second message displays are HTML rendering displays.*

(Claim 30 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **independent claim 31**, GalaxySpy teaches:

*A computer-readable medium containing instructions for performing a method for blocking dereferencing elements in a message, the method comprising:*

*accepting a source file for the message;*  
*rendering the file in a first message display output;*  
*grouping one or more elements within the rendered message into security level groups;*  
*rewriting the elements to be processed through a protocol handler;*  
*passing the message source to a second message display output;*

*rendering the message in the second message display;  
combining a base URL and a relative URL into a full URL; and  
passing the full URL to be processed to the protocol handler.*

(Claim 31 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

7. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

8. **Claims 4, 5, 17-19, and 26-28**, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding **claims 4, 17, 18, 26, and 27**:

The prior art fails to disclose or suggest every limitation of claims 4, 17, 18, 26, and 28. Accordingly, claims 4, 17, 18, 26, and 28 include allowable subject matter.

**Regarding claims 5, 19, and 28:**

Claims 5, 19, and 28 are dependent upon claims 4, 18, and 27, and thus include allowable subject matter.

***Conclusion***

9. The following prior art is made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure:

Higley, (U.S. Patent 5,790,793), teaching HTML messaging.

Wilcox, J., "New Outlook to Give Spammers the Boot," CNET News.com, November 1, 2002, published on the Internet at:

[http://news.com/New+Outlook+to+give+spammers+the+boot/2100-1001\\_3-964166.html](http://news.com/New+Outlook+to+give+spammers+the+boot/2100-1001_3-964166.html), downloaded pages 1-3.

GalaxyTrading.net, "GalaxySpy," Press Release, October 3, 2002, last downloaded by the Examiner on March 19, 2006 from:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20021003034642/www.galaxytrading.net/press/releases.jsp>, 1 page.

Gouthro, L., "Review: Tool protects and educates Web surfers," CNN.com, February 5, 2002, pages 1-2.

Individuals associated with the filing or prosecution of a patent application are reminded of their obligations pursuant to 37 CRF 1.56. See generally, MPEP 2001 and subsections.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thru Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB/mkb



DOUG HUTTON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
TECH CENTER 2100